REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.   Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,415,323 (hereinafter "McCanne"), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over McCanne.

2.   Response to 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) Rejections

In response to the Office Action, the Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 and respectfully request reconsideration thereof. All the amendments are supported by the specification as originally filed, such as Page 36, Paragraph [0078]. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over McCanne, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over McCanne. However, as further explained below, McCanne fails to teach or even suggest each and every element of the present claims. According, McCanne does not anticipate the present claims and the rejections should be removed.

McCanne describes a redirection system in which packets are routed via a redirector or ARN (Anycast referral nodes) from a client to a Service Node based on a topological locality. In particular, a request from a client is routed (path 516) to the nearest ARN (514) using proximity-based anycast routing. The ARN resolves the anycast address for the information object to a unicast address of a Service Node (518). The ARN route the unicast address to the client (path 510) which fetches the information object from the Service Node (path 520) (McCanne, Figure 5, Col. 12, lines 25-34).

Turning to claim 9 of the present application, it includes "an information object repository configured to receive the request for the information object and to map the URL into a

network layer anycast address, to resolve the network layer anycast address into a unicast address and to obtain a copy of the information object at the corresponding unicast address". It will be noted that McCanne fails to teach the presently claimed feature of obtaining a copy of the information object at the corresponding unicast address. Indeed, the ARN do not obtain a copy of the information object at the corresponding unicast address. In contrast, McCanne specifically teaches that it is the client that fetches the information object. This alone is sufficient to distinguish the present application from McCanne. Therefore, the objection should be removed.

3.   Conclusion

Having tendered the above remarks and amended the claims as indicated herein, the Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been addressed and that the claims are now in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 25, 2005

Chze Koon Chua
Reg. No. 53,831

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200